

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORICAL PROBLEMS OF THE
SECOND INTERMEDIATE PERIOD
VOLUME IV

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
DEPARTMENT OF NEAR EASTERN LANGUAGES
AND CIVILIZATIONS

BY
BRUCE WILLIAMS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

DECEMBER 1975

PART V

PALESTINE AND SYRIA IN THE MIDDLE BRONZE

II AND III AGES: TEXT

CHAPTER XVII

PROBLEMS IN THE MIDDLE BRONZE AGE

OF PALESTINE AND SYRIA

If Egypt was a country where materials were primarily found in tombs, the major materials used for Asiatic chronology have been found in city mounds. The first site used for a clear chronology of Middle Bronze Age materials was Tell Beit Mirsim; the designations for the material that Albright published are still used in Israel and the United States. This site was excavated as much according to the pottery typology as it was by stratigraphy.¹ Fundamental stratigraphic controls such as baulks were not used. Even if they had been used, the remarks in the General Introduction to this dissertation would preclude the use of the materials for the establishment of a detailed chronology.² Thus the use of important stratigraphic controls introduced by Dame Kathleen Kenyon to Palestinian archaeology has not resulted in any major improvement in the chronology of Middle Bronze Age materials, though the relationships between the various "geomorphological" features came to be better understood. The reason for this failure to successfully refine the old MB II A and II B-C chronology was confirmed by members of the Drew-McCormick expedition to Tell Balata (Shechem). They found that the major part of the material that made up the mound was taken from earlier deposits or was mixed with earlier deposits from the same mound.

¹Below, p. 1018.

²Above, pp. 6-10.

Thus later structures would be contaminated with materials from earlier times. As pointed out in the Introduction, no deposit, or even floor, is wholly safe from this problem.¹

Thus the essential problem of archaeological chronology, the establishment of a sequence of materials, can only be solved in the Middle Bronze Age by an essentially typological method. Stratigraphy is an aid only where well-defined groups (i.e. tombs) were found in a clear relationship with either important architectural features or with each other.²

The most difficult problem in dealing with the well-defined groups was determining which of them were deposited in a very short time, and which covered a longer period. This particular problem has been discussed in some detail above, and needs no repetition here.³ The problem is not as difficult to deal with in Asia as it was in Egypt or the Egyptian groups in Nubia. Many tombs in Palestine, especially those of Jericho, had the details of the interments and the stratigraphy of the material in the tombs discussed in detail. Often tombs in the mounds were single burials. Pottery was published individually or was more carefully typed than the pottery in the BSAE corpora. Thus many important details of the chronology are clearer in Palestine than they were in Egypt.

Despite the fact that typology is the most promising means of achieving a clear chronology of Middle Bronze Age materials, it has not

¹Above, p. 8 note 1.

²Below, p. 942-951, Megiddo stratigraphic relationships, and Table 23, Jericho tombs stratigraphy.

³Above, pp. 16-18.

been generally used. The most important typological chronologies produced in the last generation have been those of Kenyon at Jericho and Megiddo. These have been adapted to the discoveries of Bietak in the Egyptian Delta and have been used here.¹

One perplexing but minor problem has afflicted the study of the Middle Bronze Age in particular. That is the problem of nomenclature. We will not discuss the general problem of the technological nature of the entire Neolithic-Chalcolithic-Early Bronze-Middle Bronze-Late Bronze series. The names of the Middle Bronze Age divisions are sufficiently confusing. The old American system of MB I-IIA-IIB-C has been retained in Israel, though MB II C is no longer used. In Britain, it has become popular to use the term Early Bronze-Middle Bronze for the MB I, recognizing the many similarities between the period and the Early Bronze Age in Palestine. This designation was modified by Lapp to Intermediate Bronze; the term Early Bronze IV, used by Dever, is now coming into general use in the United States (Table 62).

The problem of what to call the old MB II A and B-C then arose. Kenyon called them MB I and II. Lapp proposed that the MB I be dropped, using the terms Intermediate Bronze and an MB II A and B-C. Although many writers would prefer a more rigorous approach, the terms MB II A and B-C are still in general use in the United States along with EB IV for the old MB I.²

¹Above, pp. 74-77.

²Paul W. Lapp, The Dhahr Mirzbaneh Tombs; Three Intermediate Bronze Age Cemeteries in Jordan (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1966), pp. v-vi; Eliezer D. Oren, "The Early Bronze IV Period in Northern Palestine and its Cultural and Chronological Setting", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 210 (1973), pp. 20-36; William G. Dever, "The EB IV-MB I Horizon in Transjordan and Southern Palestine", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 210 (1973), pp. 37-62.

There is another difference between the American and British schools in Middle Bronze Age nomenclature. Kenyon's MB II contained some materials that were assigned by Albright to MB II A. The dividing line between the British MB I and II is thus somewhat earlier and clearer than that between the MB II A and B. Since the chronology is typological, the difference is rather clearer than in the American chronology.

It is difficult to resist the temptation to add to this confusion. In the following argument, this writer will use the following designations: The old Middle Bronze I of Albright will be referred to as Early Bronze IV. This is not to imply any commitment to that particular term: I do believe, however, that the essentially Early Bronze Age nature of this period in Palestine should be recognized in whatever term is used.

Contemporary materials in Syria will be referred to as Syrian Middle Bronze I (that is Hama J, Amuq I-J etc.). I believe that the use of this designation recognizes the difference between Palestine and Syria during this period as well as the considerable difference between Early Bronze III and Middle Bronze I materials in Syria.

The next term used here is MB II. In Syria it will be used to designate materials of Amuq K, Alalakh XV-X and Hama H. There is as yet no clear evidence for subdivision.

On the coast of Syria, in Lebanon and in Palestine, the MB II is subdivided. The MB II A will be used to describe materials found at Byblos in the Royal Tombs and the deposits.¹ The use of the MB II for the materials in both Syria and Palestine is not accidental. It

¹Below, pp. 843-881.

will be asserted here that they are both related to the earlier Syrian MB I and that the coastal and Palestinian MB II were at least partly descended from the Syrian MB I.

The next stage, called here MB II B (not to be confused with Albright's MB II B, which is later), is characterized by the introduction of a red and black bichrome painting on jugs and juglets. There are many innovations in other pottery and weapons as well.¹ Two sub-phases, MB II B 1 and 2 are recognized; the second has a distinctive simplified painted style at Megiddo. As we shall see, the first Yehudiyya type punctate decoration was produced in this age.

In the last phase of the MB II, C, there is a further simplification of the pottery repertoire and the virtual abandonment of painted decoration. Many of the shapes are more sophisticated, especially the juglets. In this period, elaborate Yehudiyya decoration appears, in narrow bands.² This is the phase of MB II that appeared at Tell ed-Daba.³

The next stage of the Middle Bronze Age is the MB III. This corresponds to the MB II of Kenyon as the MB II corresponded to her MB I. It had three divisions, A, B and C. The first two had two main subdivisions. We will not discuss the details of these divisions here; they are discussed below in detail.⁴ The MB III A was the age of Early Yehudiyya ware, which we have dated by means of the Kerma terminus post quem to the later Seventeenth Century B.C. The MB III B contained late

¹Below, pp. 885-893, 919-923.

²Below, pp. 989-990.

³Above, pp. 66, 67, and 74.

⁴Below, pp. 929-936, Megiddo, pp. 1004-1008, Jericho, and pp. 1046-1005, Ajjul and South Coast.

Yehudiyya ware which was clearly dated by that same terminus post quem to the first half of the Sixteenth Century. The MB III C contained no Yehudiyya ware or even piriform juglets at all.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE MIDDLE BRONZE II A

The first stage of the Middle Bronze II was found only on or near the coast of Palestine and Syria in a few locations. Only at Byblos was the phase well-represented. There is as yet no evidence that the MB II A penetrated inland Palestine from what appears to have been an enclave on the south-west coast¹ or from the main centers on the coast of Lebanon. Only such trade goods as fenestrated axes attest to relations between the MB II A and EB IV Palestine.

Byblos

The materials from Byblos are very difficult to use, but they are of fundamental importance to our understanding of the MB II A and its relation to later periods. Groups of materials include the Royal Tombs, the private tombs and the deposits. Other materials excavated in the city were not generally found in groups, as the city was dug in horizontal spits with no direct evidence of stratigraphic relationships recorded. Nevertheless, many pots from the town may be generally compared with those found in the royal tombs. The deposits themselves formed an important group, though the stratigraphic evidence for linking them is indirect.² More pottery from the town can be linked typologically with these deposits.

¹Below, pp. 884, 1167-69.

²Below, pp. 848-849.

In addition, there was historical evidence for the date of the Royal Tombs. Further evidence for the relationship between the known dynasty of Byblos and the remains of the Royal Tombs phase and the deposits may be derived.

The Middle Bronze II A 1

The Royal Tombs

The pottery from the Royal Tombs was, as Albright pointed out, one of the most important pottery groups from the ancient Near East. Clearly dated as later than Amenemhat III (XII-6; 1842-1798/95) and Amenemhat IV (XII-7; 1798-1789), the tombs gave chronological definition to both the Byblos dynasty and the early MB II A.¹

Though the Middle Bronze II nature of these pottery groups from tombs I-III was noted by Albright, the lack of a high quality publication prevented their being used in a typological sequence (Table 64).

Miss Tufnell has filled this gap with a publication of the pottery from Royal Tombs I-III remaining in the Beirut Museum.²

The general character of the pottery from the Royal Tombs is primitive and crude compared to other Middle Bronze II-III pots in Lebanon and Palestine.

There are about forty bowls of similar ware and type, fired soft orange, with lime grits. The surface is usually worn (Fig. 241 g-j, 2 a-b). The outer surface often showed fine ridges; the rims were turned

¹W. F. Albright, "The Eighteenth Century Princes of Byblos and the Chronology of Middle Bronze", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 176 (1964), pp. 38-46, especially pp. 38-40 and 43.

²Olga Tufnell, "The Pottery from Royal Tombs I-III at Byblos", Berytus, 18 (1969), pp. 5-34.

slightly inwards. The flat disk base was normally string-cut.

The ten dishes from Tomb I are somewhat better made. One had a pinkish cast; two others were orange and coarser.²

Dipper juglets vary from red-brown to orange. Bases are pointed or flattened, rarely round. Mouth rims are pinched; the handles are round and joined roughly to the pot. One example has a round mouth³ (Fig. 242 c-i). Thirteen of the dipper juglets have a red slip and burnish. Necks are more poorly pinched and the handles are badly attached. These have ring bases and generally taller profiles (Fig. 243 a-b).⁴

Caliciform beakers and goblets with trumpet feet and two- or three-reed handles are in the same ware, with a red slip and some signs of burnishing (Fig. 243 c-f).⁵

A jug in the same ware has a cordon at the neck, with a biconical body and ring base and a thick bar handle. There is a similarly shaped jar, also with the cordon at the neck, which had a thick flaky red slip (Fig. 244 a,c).⁶

The two spouted jugs or "teapots" are similar in shape to the biconical jug, but they have wider rims and the tall spout as well as two-part handles. They had smooth black burnished slips. There is a potmark on the base.⁷

The amphorae have a sharply tapered shape which was quite unusual in the Middle Bronze II-III. The rims are out-turned and probably folded over. The shoulder handles were large and round in section. The

¹Ibid., p. 11.

²Ibid., pp. 11-12.

³Ibid., p. 12.

⁴Ibid., pp. 12-14. ⁵Ibid., p. 14. ⁶Ibid. ⁷Ibid., pp. 14-15.

ware is fired soft, coarse orange with many white and black grits. One jar is reddish brown. Wheel or paddle marks can be seen from neck to base. Potmarks are on four of the eight remaining examples¹ (Fig. 243 g-h).

Two large pithoi were over a meter high. They are bag-shaped (actually almost biconical) and handleless, with folded rims (Fig. 245 c).²

Miss Tufnell, who considers the Royal Tombs of Byblos contemporary with the later Middle Bronze III of Palestine, noted some curious points about the group:

Altogether there were about a hundred registered vessels in the Royal Tombs I-III at Byblos, not counting undocumented storage jars, quite a modest supply when divided between three local rulers which compares unfavorably both in quantity and quality with the grave goods of ordinary citizens in Palestine at that time. Except for the sophisticated burnished jugs and dippers which have been described, the rest of the pottery is clearly local and undistinguished, turned out by potters who were still working in a style and technique long since obsolete in Palestine. The plain shapes of the bowls and cups, the apparent combing of the surface and the provision of pot marks are all in an earlier tradition.³

Apart from the general absurdity of rustic pottery at Byblos being contemporary with sophisticated ceramics in Palestine, there are a number of points to be raised about the relations of this pottery elsewhere. The Byblos pottery from the Royal Tombs may have many local features, but it is not purely local. The hemispherical bowls (Fig. 241 a, b) are characteristic of Egyptian pottery groups in Haraga A, which was more or less contemporary.⁴ The sinuous-sided bowls (Fig. 242 a and b) are also characteristic of Egyptian pottery at this time. Tapered cups could be related either to Egyptian pottery groups, or more

¹Ibid., pp. 15-16.

²Ibid., fig. 7.

³Ibid., p. 16.

⁴Above, p. 121.

likely, to the Syrian MB I in Hama J or the Til Barsip Hypogeum.¹ The larger tapered bowls with inverted rims may also be compared to Syrian MB I materials, which they resemble more than they do the convex bowls of the Middle Bronze III.² Biconical jars also appear in the Syrian Middle Bronze I, especially in the Til Barsip Hypogeum, even with the shoulder handles seen later in the Middle Bronze II.³ The handleless jar with vertical neck (Fig. 44 c) may also be related to the jars with vertical necks common in the Syrian Middle Bronze I, though the resemblance is more vague.⁴

Though Miss Tufnell's comparisons between the Byblos Royal Tombs and Kültepe II are chronologically apt, the comparisons with Middle Bronze II-III Palestine may be chronologically inappropriate, leading her to assume that Byblos was a backwater.

Though the amphorae, dippers and Egyptian relationships of the Byblos Royal Tombs pottery are distinctive, there are a number of clear relationships with the Middle Bronze I of Syria. In addition, we will note below some continued relationships which should indicate that the Middle Bronze II A of Byblos was descended in part from the Middle Bronze I of Syria; the continued Middle Bronze I traits present at

¹E. Fugmann, Hama; Fouilles et Recherches de la Fondation Carlsberg 1931-1938; L'Architecture des périodes pré-hellénistiques, Nationalmuseets Skrifter Større Beretninger IV (Copenhagen: Nationalmuseet, 1958), p. 74, fig. 93, 3 H 100, bowl with inverted rim; 3 K 208, tapered cup.

²Ibid.

³Claude Schaeffer, Stratigraphie Comparée et Chronologie de l'Asie Occidentale (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), fig. 81, number 51.

⁴Compare fig. 5 c with fig. 81 number 51.

Byblos were absent from the Middle Bronze II-III elsewhere.

MB II A 1 Pottery from the town

Pottery from the phase of the Royal Tombs is rather simple and thus rather difficult to separate from that of other times (Figs. 246-248). Very irregular, plump dippers and convex tapered cups occur in some numbers. A caliciform cup with sinuous profile is clearly related to the caliciform cups of the Royal Tombs (Fig. 246 g). Tall dippers with ring bases are likewise related to examples from the Royal Tombs (Fig. 248, a-c) as is a biconical jug. Appendix D contains a list of whole pots used here from the Byblos publication. The number of MB II A 1 pots found in the town is large enough for us to determine that this pottery was the characteristic pottery of the town of Byblos in the time of the Royal Tombs. Since these are whole pots, they must have been found in the original places of deposition. No conclusion that the pottery of the Byblos Royal Tombs is unique to these tombs is justified.

The Middle Bronze II A 2

This is the phase of the Deposits at Byblos (Table 64). Though there are changes in the shapes of various pots, the most important change is in the decoration of the pottery. The pottery of the Royal Tombs phase is undecorated or had a simple dark burnished slip. In the phase of the Deposits, painted decoration is introduced. It is normally red-brown paint on a "salmon" background, and is linear in style (Figs. 252-257).

Like the pottery of the Royal Tombs phase, the MB II A 1, pottery of this stage was found in the town, generally under circumstances that gave no clear clue to the stratigraphic position of the pot.

The Deposits themselves were often contained in pots that belonged to this painted style. Though there was no complete evidence of their stratigraphic position, it has been determined that they were associated with four buildings, the "Champ des Offrandes", the "Enceinte Sacrée", the "Temple Syrien" and the "Temple aux Obelisques".¹ The Deposits were not only found in or near the buildings mentioned, but they were in all cases at or below the level of the buildings.²

The Obelisk temple was not only the most intriguing and culturally important of these structures, but it also contained the evidence for dating the Deposits themselves. The first item of evidence is somewhat indirect; it would appear that the Deposits, from their large number and rather random disposition, were connected with the abandonment rather than the construction of these buildings. One of the two true obelisks in the Obelisk Temple is inscribed "beloved of Hršf(RC) the prince of Byblos (h3ty-c n Kpn) Abishemu (ib-šmw whm cnb) ([....] f) Kukkun son of Ruqqa (Kwkwn s3 rwqq m3c hrw) deceased."³ That is, an obelisk erected by or in the name of Abishemu (I or II?) for another

¹Ora Negbi and S. Moskowitz, "The 'Foundation Deposits' or 'Offering Deposits' of Byblos", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 184 (1966), pp. 21-26. Chart p. 25 contains a resume of the deposits by absolute level in relation to the four structures. Except for the "Depot Isolée" which was typologically different and is not considered here, all of the deposits were found associated with or below the four structures. None were found above them. The association of the deposits with the structures is especially clear in the case of the Obelisk Temple. Deposits 14433 and 14560 were actually associated with the temple. In addition, objects of Deposit type were found on the floors of the "Temple Syrien" and the Obelisk Temple (pp. 22-23).

²See note 1, above.

³Pierre Montet, "Notes et Documents pour servir à l'histoire des relations entre l'Égypte et la Syrie", Kemi, 16 (1962), pp. 76-96; p. 96 for inscribed obelisk; Albright, "The Eighteenth Century Princes of Byblos", p. 42, note 17.

man who is deceased; he may have been a Lycian.¹ If this Abishemu was either Abishemu I or II of the dynasty of Byblos that reigned in the Eighteenth Century;² the building must have been in use during that time. The Deposits must therefore be later than Abishemu I at least.

A second item of evidence may date the Deposits more directly. Deposit 14433 was found in the corner of the "Pro-cella" of the Obelisk Temple. It contained a large number of faience animals including the hippopotami that have been clearly dated in Egypt to the later Eighteenth Century B.C. and later.

Since the Deposits must be later than an Abishemu of the Dynasty of Byblos, they can be no earlier than the Eighteenth Century; since their pottery differed so much from that of the Royal Tombs, the date must be well after those tombs.

The faiences from the Deposit from the Pro-Cella of the Obelisk Temple indicate that that date is no earlier than the later Eighteenth Century. That Deposit contained not only characteristic objects of the Deposits, but MB II A pottery and one faience chalice with sinuous side and handle below the bulge in the cup, a characteristic MB II A type.³

Pottery that contained deposits

Most of the jars that contained deposits are of two types.

¹S. Horn, "Byblos in Ancient Records", Andrews University Semitic Studies, 1 (1963), pp. 52-61; Albright, "The Eighteenth Century Princes of Byblos", for the Lycian.

²Below, pp. 871-872; above, pp. 220-221.

³Maurice Dunand, Fouilles de Byblos Tome II 1933-1938, plates, République Libanaise, Directions de l'Instruction et du Beaux-Arts; Études et Documents d'Archéologie vol. II (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste, Paul Geuthner, 1958), number 15292.

Most common is a simple bulged cylinder with a flat base; this rarely was given any kind of rim treatment (Fig. 257). Lids are inverted convex or tapered bowls with loops at the top, or a bulged stump. Amphorae are sometimes used for the deposits (Fig. 256). These are not so sharply tapered as the amphorae from the Royal Tombs; the mouths are wider, perhaps to accommodate the non-liquid contents. In one case, the pot used to contain a deposit is a large dipper (Fig. 256) of MB II type. Such oversize dippers are used in Palestine later as pitchers (Fig. 314 a, c). Decoration on these pots is in the simple linear patterns mentioned above. It is in vertical or horizontal bands of hatching, cross-hatching, zig-zags with occasional trees or impaled chevrons. Jar 2000 has a band of crossed medallions.

MB II A 2 pottery from the town

The Deposit pots are thus closely related to each other in shape and decoration. Other pots from the town have similar decoration and should be related to the deposits. Some pottery without decoration may be linked to the deposit phase as well. A number of sherds were found with the Deposit from the Pro-cella of the Obelisk Temple. These include fragments of dippers with moderate proportions, better shaped than those of the Royal Tombs (MB II A 2-B). We have already mentioned the faience model of a sinuous-sided chalice from the deposit; there was one of a shoulder-handled jar as well.¹

The pottery from the town with Deposit-style decoration includes cups, chalices and dippers as well as a few juglets, the first from the MB II. The cups and chalices appear to be developments from the footed

¹Ibid., number 15389.

chalices and the cups of the Royal Tombs. The earliest have a sinuous profile and a narrow base, but closed at the bottom. The trumpet foot has been replaced. A loop handle is put on the narrow lower body of the cup. The next development is a cup with very wide angled brim which resembled the chalice in other respects. Finally the handle is put on simple convex cups (Fig. 252). Decoration on the cups and dippers appears to have been horizontal, simply lines, bands and groups of narrow lines, with occasional zig-zags (Fig. 253, 254).

Other than the pottery of the deposits, there is only one other group of pots from this phase, numbers 3924-30 (Fig. 255 a). The group contained two censers, two plump dippers, one with flat base, and three juglets. Two of these have the bevelled-in rim characteristic of the MB II juglets later. One is a ring juglet with horizontal bands painted on the neck and poorly organized painted decoration on the ring. A second juglet has the flattened globular shape of pilgrim flasks.¹ It is decorated with slashes on the rim and handle, horizontal bands on the neck, and spirals encircled by a zig-zag on the body; this decoration will be seen in the MB II-III in the "Canaanite" area (Figs. 285, 296). A third juglet is more unusual. It is more ovoid, with a band of cross-hatched triangles on the shoulder and spirals on the body. The neck of the juglet is a bird-headed man.² The cross-hatched triangles link this juglet with the jugs of Ras el Ain (Figs. 388, 389) and decoration on jugs in North Syria,³ as well as an important local jar.

¹Maurice Dunand, Fouilles de Byblos Tome 1er 1926-32; République Libanaise, Directions de l'Instruction et du Beaux-Arts, Études et Documents d'Archéologie vol. I (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste, Paul Geuthner, 1939), number 3928.

²Ibid., number 3926. ³Below, pp.1151-1153, Syrian jugs.

It should be clear from the number of clearly identifiable pots of MB II A 2 date (Appendix D), that Deposit-type pottery is the characteristic pottery of Byblos in the period that followed the Royal Tombs.

The Montet Jar

This jar has been linked, on the basis of the technique of manufacture, to the Third Millennium B.C. Yet the technique of manufacture, with a hand-made body that has had a wheel-made rim set into it, was characteristic of the EB IV in Palestine.¹ The plastic decoration of the jar, applied ropes, is characteristic of other storage jars of Byblos and of Hama H in Syria.² The shape of the Montet Jar resembles that of the amphorae of the deposits, except that it is better proportioned. The lid has the same excellence of proportion, and the loop-handles is a well-made serpent. The painted decoration of the Montet Jar is definitive. The horizontal groups of narrow bands and zig-zag lines are entirely characteristic of the other deposits. The cross-hatched triangles on the shoulder of the jar occur on the juglet from the little group cited above, as well as several jugs and jars of

¹Olga Tufnell and William A. Ward, "Relations Between Byblos, Egypt and Mesopotamia at the End of the Third Millennium B.C.; A Study of the Montet Jar", Syria, 43 (1966), pp. 165-241, especially pp. 168-172; Ruth Amiran, Ancient Pottery of the Holy Land from its Beginnings in the Neolithic Period to the End of the Iron Age (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1970), p. 80. Mrs. Amiran assigns to her group A of the EB IV (MB I) pots that have a hand-made body and wheel-made rim. Group A is probably the latest of these families; Albright, "The Chronology of Middle Bronze I", Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 168 (1962), pp. 36-42, for a discussion of the problem; William C. Dever, "The 'Middle Bronze I' Period in Syria and Palestine", in James A. Sanders, editor, Near Eastern Archaeology in the Twentieth Century; Essays in Honor of Nelson Glueck (Garden City: Doubleday and Company., 1970), pp. 132-163.

²Below, pp. 1129-1133.

the MB II B. The Montet Jar clearly has distinctive characteristics of the Deposit phase and should be dated with these deposits (Fig. 257 c).

The date of the contents of the Deposits

Dating the Deposits was a fairly simple matter. With the help of the *stratigraphic studies of Negbi and Moskowitz*, it can be seen that some of the Deposits were connected with the Obelisk Temple which contained an obelisk of Abishemu. The faience vessels and figurines from that temple refine the date further, to the late Eighteenth Century B.C. Dating the contents of the Deposits is another problem entirely. Many of the objects found in the Deposits are not part of well-known typological series. They cannot be dated with precision in either Asia or Egypt. Weapons, however, have been frequently found and studied from this period. Two types of weapons found frequently in the Deposits, spearheads and crescentic axes will be discussed here. In addition, some remarks about torques and molds found at Byblos outside the Deposits may help date the contents of the Deposits.

Spearheads

The various forms of slotted and tanged spearheads are found in generally later Third Millennium contexts.¹ This type occurs in Tomb Tat Alaça Hüyük, Troy II, Tarsus Early Bronze III and at Til Barsip in the later form with a squared shoulder.² Latest examples of the type

¹Rachael Maxwell-Hyslop, "Daggers and Swords in Western Asia; A Study from Prehistoric Times to 600 B.C.", *Iraq*, 8 (1946), type 29 with rivets and type 14 with tang; D. Stronach, "The Development and Diffusion of Metal Types in Early Bronze Age Anatolia", *Anatolian Studies*, 7 (1957), pp. 89-125; types 2-2d on pp. 108-111.

²Ibid., p. 109.

are from Middle Cycladic I and Kültepe; there is an example with a button tang from Beyçesultan IV c.¹ The group of slotted spearheads seems to occur widely in the later Third Millennium B.C.; it still exists in the early Second Millennium.

The later stage in the development of the slotted spearhead is contemporary with the development of spearheads with bent tangs.² As Stronach pointed out, the type may be descended from the Mesopotamian Early Dynastic spear-butts.³ Both the square-section spear-butt and the true bent-tang spearhead are found in the Til Barsip Hypogeum, Tell Kara Hasan, and at Soli. The tangs are bent, but there are no examples with button-tangs. Some decoration occurs on the rounded shafts.⁴ The most advanced type of bent-tang spearhead has a button on the end of the tang, a stop on the shaft and an almost cylindrical midrib.⁵ It is this technologically advanced type that occurs, with one exception, as the bent-tang spearhead in the Byblos deposits. A slightly earlier type with stop was found at Bogazköy, in Büyükkale IV C of the Middle Bronze Age,⁶ at Tarsus in a silo, probably of EB IV or MB I transitional date.⁷ Another example with simply a stop occurred in Ajjul in EB IV context.⁸ At Ugarit the fully developed bent tang spearhead with button tang and stop was found in a deposit with a long-socket spearhead and a dagger with double rib or groove. They were dated to the end of "Ugarit Ancien

¹Ibid., p. 110.

²Ibid., p. 111.

³Ibid., pp. 113-114.

⁴Ibid., p. 116, fig. 9, 2, 3.

⁵Ibid., p. 117.

⁶Schaeffer, Stratigraphie Comparée, fig. 4.

⁷Stronach, "The Development and Diffusion of Metal Types in Early Bronze Age Anatolia", p. 117.

⁸Schaeffer, Stratigraphie Comparée, fig. 121.

3" by the excavator. Since the U A 3" is MB I in date,¹ these spearheads are close to those of the other sites in date.

The most clearly dated contexts for the tanged spears are the Beni Hasan paintings of foreigners in tomb 3.² The Beni Hasan tombs of the nomarchs contained very lifelike representations of battle scenes, taking some care in the representation of military equipment. The weapons represented in the tombs are functional and rather precisely represented. The representations change both in style slightly and in content from tomb to tomb, indicating that current forms were represented and that the scenes of daily life, at least, were not taken from scribal handbooks.³ The group of foreigners from tomb 3 were painted in great detail. The spears, tied on the back of the donkey and carried by the small boy, show no bronze below the blade. As both socketed and stopped tanged spears would show a shaft of bronze on the shaft of the spear, we can only conclude that these spearheads were of the plain bent-tang type. This clear context tends to indicate that the development of stopped, button-tang spearheads occurred after the reign of Senwosret II, or in the Nineteenth Century.⁴

The next development is that of the socketed spearhead. These occurred in two basic types at Byblos. The earliest is a type with a long, pointed blade and a long socket. These tend to have a heavy

¹Below, pp.1099-1100.

²Newberry, Beni Hasan I, plate XXXI; W. Wreszinski, Atlas zur altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1923-40), plate 9.

³Above, p. 37.

⁴There may be a type with a midrib represented in the tomb of Djehutyhetep (Bersheh I, plate XIII).

midrib, like the latest tanged spearheads. Other examples of this type occur at Ras Shamra in the deposit that contained the button-tang spearheads¹ and at Kom el Hisn in Egypt in tombs of the type that contained fenestrated axes.² The later form with shorter more convex blade and socket is common in the Byblos deposits and was the only type of spearhead found in MB II B contexts later at Ras el Ain, Megiddo, Sidon and even Byblos itself.³ This type occurs in another, poorly dated deposit at Ras Shamra;⁴ though the long socket spearhead may have appeared in the Nineteenth Century, there is no positive evidence for either socketed spearhead before the Eighteenth Century B.C.

The crescentic axe

This axe, with its descendants and variants, has received a good deal of attention in the literature. There remain many typological and chronological problems with this object in Asia. The Egyptian evidence for the crescentic axe has been neglected, partly out of fear that Egyptian conservatism might distort the dates, and partly because the conclusions to be derived from the Egyptian evidence are not what most archaeologists of Western Asia might desire.

In describing the various forms of this axe, we will use the following terms. Crescentic axes are the entire series of axes with curved cutting edges and their variants from the Early Dynastic types

¹Above, p. 855.

²Hamada and Farid, "Excavations at Kom el Hisn, Third Season, 1945", plate VII.

³Below, pp. 886, 891-892, 937, 989.

⁴Below, pp. 1101.

to the "Duck Bill".¹ Solid crescentic axes with bent or straight hafts are axes with hafts that either curve with the blade, as at Kish, or are straight, as at Deshasha. Lunate or epsilon axes refer to those with the haft attached at two, three, or even more places leaving a visible space between haft and blade. These can have a bent haft form as well. The three-socket epsilon axe was a form with sockets instead of tangs. The anchor axe is a transitional type with a socket at the center, a broad back and half-sockets at either end of the blade. In the case of the fenestrated axe the two-half sockets have joined the back, leaving two holes or fenestrations. Later, this blade was more and more elongated; eventually the elongate "Duck Bill" axe evolved (in MB II A 2).

Our earliest examples of the bent haft crescentic axe are Mesopotamian, from Ur² and Kish.³ These are both of Early Dynastic date. The general type appears to continue in the Akkad Period. The form found on most stelae generally dated to this period has an angular blade with straight cutting edge and the central tang wrapped around the haft.⁴

¹This was dated to the end of the MB II A by its occurrence in the Byblos Deposits and to the MB II B by its occurrence at Sidon (pp. 891-92), Byblos Private Tombs (pp. 885-886) and Amrith (pp. 902-904).

²C. Leonard Woolley, Ur Excavations, Vol. II: The Royal Cemetery of Ur; A Report on the Predynastic and Sargonid Graves Excavated Between 1926 and 1931 (New York: Published for the Trustees of the Two Museums, British Museum and University Museum, 1934), plate 234.

³Represented on an inlay; Stephen Langdon and Ernest Mackay, Excavations at Kish, vol. I (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1924), plate XVII, 8, ED III.

⁴John F. McKeon, "An Akkadian Victory Stele", Boston Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin, 68 (1970), pp. 226-243, figs. 2, 10, 11. Types of this axe with narrower blades may be ancestors of the Khepesh sword as well as the crescentic axe. The sickle-sword would solve the hafting problem by making the entire weapon metal.

No examples of bent-haft crescentic axe are preserved or represented in Egypt. The type with straight haft is represented at Deshasha in the siege scene in the tomb of Inti in the Sixth Dynasty.¹ This same type is represented in the tomb of Baqti I at Beni Hasan at the end of the Heracleopolitan Period or the start of the Eleventh Dynasty's rule in Middle Egypt.²

In the tomb of Baqti III, the axes represented in the siege scene include a solid, nearly semicircular type in the hands of foreigners and a lunate axe held by an Egyptian.³

The last Eleventh Dynasty tomb, that of Akhtoi, contains a siege scene with Asiatics carrying epsilon axes with straight hafts.⁴ The tangs of the epsilon axes are clearly shown protruding from the haft. Some of the Asiatics carried a curiously shaped shield.

The tomb of Khnemhotep I was constructed during, possibly also after, the reign of Amenemhat I.⁵ For the first time, Egyptians are shown carrying the straight-haft epsilon axe with a broad blade. Asiatics in this tomb are shown carrying the triple-socket epsilon axe.⁶

The battle scene in the tomb of Amenemhat shows the same type of

¹W. M. F. Petrie, Deshasheh, Memoirs of the Egypt Exploration Fund, vol. 15 (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898), plate IV.

²Newberry, Beni Hasan II, tomb 29, plate XXIX above.

³Ibid., plate V. The siege scene was particularly vigorous and elaborate in this tomb.

⁴Ibid., tomb 17, plate XV; Wreszinski, Atlas der altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte, I, tafel 9. The siege scene in this tomb was more spread out and less sanguinary, as well as less vigorous.

⁵Newberry, Beni Hasan I, number 14, plate XLVII.

⁶See fig. 23 b-c. Only one axe of this type known to me exists, in the Cairo Museum. There are, however, two molds, one from Byblos.

axes in the hands of Egyptians, though these may have riveted sockets.¹ Asiatics are shown with spears for the first time, apparently tanged, as well as heavy clubs.²

The tomb of Khnemhotep II, from the reign of Senwosret II, contains no battle scene, but the famous caravan of Asiatics. We have already discussed the type of spear they are shown carrying as the main weapon. The last man in the file carried a heavy bent stick, like the Asiatics in the tomb of Amenemhat. Behind his hand hangs an object that has been taken to be a duck-bill axe.³ With the help of Wreszinsky's photograph, we can determine that this object is definitely not an axe, but probably a bag looped over the end of the stick.

At Bersheh, axes shown in the tomb of Djehuty-hetep from the reigns of Senwosret II and III are still the epsilon axe with curved blade.⁴

In the entire series of Egyptian tomb representations of the Twentieth and early Nineteenth Centuries there are no examples of anchor axes, fenestrated axes, or even straight-edged epsilon axes. These should, therefore, be later. The solid crescentic axe is represented down to the Middle Kingdom. The tanged epsilon axe was apparently introduced by Asiatics only at the end of the Eleventh Dynasty, but in a fairly advanced form. The triple-socket epsilon axe appeared in the early Twelfth Dynasty. Egyptians used the epsilon axe with curved blade

¹Ibid., plates XV and XVI, tomb 2, dated to Senwosret I.

²Wreszinski, Atlas der altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte, plate 7; Newberry, Beni Hasan I, plate XVI.

³Wreszinski, Atlas der altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte, plate 9.

⁴Newberry, El Bersheh I, plates XX and XIII.

throughout the period of the Twelfth Dynasty tomb representations. Since foreigners with axes are not represented after the time of Amenemhat at Beni Hasan, we are not informed about the axes they used.

With these chronological conclusions in mind, we may now consider the contexts and types of axes in Asia. We have already noted above the bent-haft crescentic axes from the Early Dynastic III at Kish and Ur. These seem to have given way to a type with a buried tang which appears to have been the ancestor of the epsilon axe.¹ In these, the central tang is clearly too short to allow for the epsilon effect. A form with bent or looped tangs was cited by Stronach in the Early Dynastic III, a further experiment.² This type, with a straight cutting edge, was found on Akkadian representations.

Axes with a long central tang may have been the direct ancestors of the epsilon axe. Stronach saw in the bulge on the Jericho axe blade the skeuomorph of a rivet used to hold the blade to a tang.³ It seems more likely however that this was a stop intended for a buried tang, bent-haft solid crescentic axe, as were a mold from Byblos (Fig. 260 a), and two axeheads from Anatolia.⁴ The single small rivet in the tang could never stand the force of a heavy blow. The next development was the placing of the stop farther down the tang, allowing the appearance

¹Langdon and Mackay, Excavations at Kish, vol. I, plate XIX appears to have had three tangs.

²Ibid., plate XXXVI; Stronach, "The Development and Diffusion of Metal Types in Early Bronze Age Anatolia", p. 122.

³Ibid., p. 123.

⁴Ibid., p. 123. The axe from Bayinderköy the probably the same type, also 136 from the Soli hoard, S 3398, which was a bent-haft crescentic rather than an epsilon axe. The Tell el Hesi axe was unstratified, but belongs to this group.

of gaps between the wood of the haft and the metal of the blade. This is the first true epsilon axe.

The bent-haft epsilon axe appears at Ur, Soli and Satir Hüyük near Sakçe Gözü.¹ The example from Ur is most developed. It is this type of bent-haft epsilon axe that is shown on the seal of Ilushuila from the Diyala at the end of the Third Dynasty of Ur.²

The straight-haft epsilon axe appears simple; it is actually the culmination of its type. One was found in the MB I in the Til Barsip Hypogeum; another was found at Susa.³ A very convex form appeared in Egypt carried by Asiatic soldiers at the end of the Eleventh Dynasty; its narrower form was adopted as the main battle weapon in Egypt. One example came from a Byblos deposit. An elaborate form of this type appeared with three sockets in the time of Amenemhat I in the representations. Though examples of socketed epsilon axes are almost nonexistent, there was one in the Cairo Museum. Two molds for axes of this type were found at Byblos that showed that this type was the manufactured type in Asia (Fig. 23 b and c).

The complex and interesting anchor axe evolved from the nearly semicircular epsilon axe. In this type, the central socket expanded into a broad back, with two half-sockets at the ends of the back. Ward

¹Stronach, "The Development and Diffusion of Metal Types in Early Bronze Age Anatolia", fig. 13, 5; Woolley, The Royal Cemetery at Ur, plate 224, U 11754; Soli, S 3398, is found in Stronach, "The Development and Diffusion of Metal Types in Early Bronze Age Anatolia", fig. 13, 7; the Satir Hüyük example is in *ibid.*, p. 123.

²Henri Frankfort, Seton Lloyd, and Thorkild Jackbsen, The Gimil-sin Temple and the Palace of the Rulers at Tell Asmar, Oriental Institute Publication 48 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940), p. 215.

³Schaeffer, Stratigraphie Comparée, fig. 82-5.

considered this a rare type and was able to cite only a few examples.¹ One example came from Byblos,² one from an unknown place in Syria,³ one from Ur, from an "Akkad" grave,⁴ and one from Helwan.⁵ Only the example from Ur was found with pottery or datable objects. Nissen dated the grave to the Akkad period⁶ but judged the pottery to be Akkad to Ur III in date. The only grave stratified above this tomb was dated to the Third Dynasty of Ur in Nissen's opinion.⁷ To the above list, I add a mold from Byblos (Fig. 23 d) a curious form with four tiny sockets added to the main one in the Cairo museum⁸ and an example from Abydos.⁹ This last was found with an epsilon axe with straight edge, a type not represented in the Middle Kingdom tombs. It should be later, dated to the

¹William A. Ward, "Relations Between Egypt and Mesopotamia from Prehistoric Times to the End of the Middle Kingdom", Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient, 7 (1964), p. 135 ff.

²Dunand, Fouilles de Byblos I, p. 199, number 3070, plate XCVI.

³Claude Schaeffer, Ugaritica III, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, vol. 64 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1956), plate 26.7.

⁴Woolley, The Royal Cemetery at Ur, U 9687.

⁵Zaki Saad, Royal Excavations at Saqqara and Helwan, Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte, Supplement 3 (Cairo: Institut français d'Archeologie Orientale, 1947), pp. 173-75, plate 88, tomb 304.

⁶Hans Nissen, Zur Datierung des Königsfriedhofs von Ur; Beiträge zur Ur and Frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie des Mittelmeer-Kulturräume, Band 3 (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1966), tomb 691, plan 221, pots 5, 50, 142, 18; p. 174, profile XXIII-5.

⁷Ibid., tomb 596, same plan and profile.

⁸Journal d'Entrée number unknown. It was a gift of King Farouq.

⁹W. M. F. Petrie, Tombs of the Courtiers and Oxyrhynchus, British School of Archaeology in Egypt, vol. 37 (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1926), plate V, 27 and 28.

mid-Nineteenth Century at the earliest. If the Abydos axe is to be dated in the Nineteenth Century, a date in the Third Dynasty of Ur for the axe found at Ur would not be inconsistent.¹

Like the anchor axe, the fenestrated axe was absent from the representations at Beni Hasan and Bersha. This alone would indicate that the axe was later than this series of tombs, or later Nineteenth Century in date. The type occurred from Persia to the Mediterranean and from Anatolia to Egypt. In Palestine, it has been found in the wall of Temple 4040 at Megiddo and in an Early Bronze IV type tomb with no pottery,² in a hoard from an EB IV pot at Jericho,³ and recently in an EB IV context at Ma'abaroth in north-west Palestine.⁴ One well-dated example was found in Kültepe II,⁵ but it was somewhat elongated; the true duck-bill axe has not been found at Kültepe. Another example was found at Soli, dated by Bittel to the earlier Second Millennium.⁶ Some examples were found in Hama H tombs, to be dated to the Eighteenth

¹Below, pp.1159-66. I am using the Low Chronology.

²Gordon Loud, Megiddo II; Seasons of 1935-39, Oriental Institute Publication, 62 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), plates 182-83; P. L. O. Guy and Robert Engberg, Megiddo Tombs, Oriental Institute Publication, 33 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938), p. 115, plate 163, tomb 84 C.

³Ernst Sellin and Carl Watzinger, Jericho: Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen, Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft, vol. 22 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Buchhandlung, 1913), p. 118, fig. 105.

⁴R. Gophna, "A Middle Bronze Age I Tomb with Fenestrated Axe at Ma'abarot", Israel Exploration Journal, 19 (1969), pp. 174-77.

⁵Tahsin Ozgüç, Kültepe-Kaniş; New Researches at the Center of the Assyrian Trading Colonies (Ankara: Turk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi, 1959), fig. 64.

⁶Rachel Maxwell-Hyslop, "Western Asiatic Shaft-Hole Axes", Iraq, 11 (1949), p. 119.

Century.¹ Fenestrated axes from Ras Shamra seem to have occurred in burials without pots, but with torques, parallel to the Byblos deposits and the Megiddo tomb.² South of Ras Shamra, an example was found in a tomb at Amrith, below remains of the MB II B.³ Some fenestrated axes have been found in Egypt at Kom el Hisn.

Dating the Kom el Hisn cemetery is difficult, since the pottery was published without groups. We have dealt with the problem in the introduction to Part I.⁴ The fenestrated axes were not found with the pottery of earlier times. They were found with other weapons, daggers with single ribs and veins in sand-pit graves.⁵ Activity in the area by the MB II A 2 was demonstrated by the discovery of a large dipper with groups of wavy and narrow horizontal bands found in some rubbish above the graves.⁶ Since none of the other contexts were entirely clearly dated, the date of the fenestrated axe should be established by the occurrence in the Byblos Deposits and Kültepe II. As we shall see, the occurrences at Hama belong generally to the Eighteenth Century.⁷ The occurrence at Amrith was stratified just below MB II B, with no evidence of any earlier period than MB II present.⁸

¹Below, p. 1136.

²Claude Schaeffer, Ugaritica II; Nouvelles études relatives aux découvertes de Ras Shamra, Bibliothèque archéologique et historiques, vol. 47 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Beuthner, 1949), pp. 53-58.

³Below, p. 904

⁴Above, pp. 48-59,

⁵Shewfik Farid, oral communication, 1973. This concerned one of the axes only, Journal d'Entrée 86910. However, he stated that the fenestrated axes were found with other weapons in the sand-pit burials, which contained no pottery. (Journal d'Entree 87478 was also displayed, with a lug at the back--there was no mention of other contents of the tomb.)

⁶Hamada and Farid, "Kom el Hisn II", p. 198, fig. 15, p. 197.

⁷Below, pp. 1129-1135.

⁸Below, p. 904.

The latest type of the crescentic axe was the so called duck-bill axe. This was a very elongated form intended for penetration, and its small size, like that of the normal fenestrated axe, is curious for a putative battle weapon. Duck-bill axes are quite common in collections of Levantine materials, but they have been more rarely found in context. We will encounter it several times in our discussion of MB II B 1 contexts at Sidon¹ and Byblos² (the private tombs). It was found in an MB II B 1 context at Amrith.³ The publication of Ras Shamra has perhaps confused its date, since there it was called Ugarit Moyen 1 and 2, with little justification for such a long time span.⁴ Several examples were found in Hama H, more at Baghouz in the MB II cemetery, and there were miniatures and representations from the Palace at Mari.⁵ Single examples came from Yauron in the extreme south of Lebanon⁵ and from Tell Dan.⁶ One very broad example was found at Beth Shan with socketed spearheads, a curious two-veined dagger, and scarab of so-called Second Intermediate Period type.⁷ Probably the earliest examples of duck-bill axes came from one Byblos Deposit.⁸ These were the only examples of this type of axe from these deposits; true fenestrated axes were far more common, though some were rather elongated. The date

¹Below, pp. 891-892.

²Below, pp. 885-886.

³Below, pp. 902-905.

⁴Below, pp. 1102-1106.

⁵Unpublished; now in the Toledo Museum of Art.

⁶Below, p. 1001.

⁷Eliezer D. Oren, "A Middle Bronze Age Warrior Tomb at Beth Shan", Zeitschrift für Deutsche Palästina-Verein, 87 (1971), pp. 109-39. Since the true duck-bill axe appeared in the MB II A at Byblos, the EB IV date of this tomb may be appropriate.

⁸Deposit 10585.

of this type of axe extends from the end of the MB II A 2 in the Byblos deposits to the MB II B 1 at Byblos, Sidon and Amrith. As we shall see examples from Hama H, Baghouz and Mari are of the same date.¹ The date, as shown by the faiences from the Byblos Deposit, must be at the end of the Eighteenth Century.

The known fenestrated axes are dated to the Middle Bronze II A at Byblos and Kültepe; in Palestine they are dated to the more backward, probably contemporary Early Bronze IV. The duck-billed axe is found in Middle Bronze II B 1 contexts and from the end of the MB II A 2. To the east, it was found in Hama H tombs, the Baghouz cemetery and in the Mari Palace (minatures and representations).

The weapons found in the Byblos Deposits, the stopped, button-tang spear, the socketed spearhead and the fenestrated axes are all products of the Nineteenth and Eighteenth Centuries B.C. There were only rare earlier types that occurred in these deposits, such as the single epsilon axe. If weapons are a fair index of the date of other objects in the deposits, most, if not all, of the objects are to be dated to the same two centuries.

The torque

Torques, with curled ends and heavy bar backs, were found associated with fenestrated axes in the Byblos Deposits and the tombs called those of the "Porteurs de Torques" at Ras Shamra. In Egypt, a torque was found at Illahun in a room with a group of tools.² Another

¹Below, pp. 1121, 1123, 1133-35.

²Petrie, Illahun, Kahun and Gurob, plate XIII, number 18, group 1-18.

example was found in a burial of Middle Kingdom type at Buhen.¹ Both contexts were of the later Twelfth or Thirteenth Dynasties.² The courtyard cemetery at Ajjul contained a torque assigned here to the earliest group of that cemetery,³ MB II A.

Representations of Asiatics in Egyptian tombs showed no jewelry on the neck that could be a torque. The latest representations of foreigners in the tomb of Khnemhotep II at Beni Hasan have a simple line around the neck, that could not be a torque. A pectoral with the name of Amenemhat III from Dahshur had an Asiatic represented on it with a neck ornament that could be a torque.⁴

The Tod treasure, dated to the reign of Amenemhat II, contained heavy bars of metal with rather triangular ends; the torque with curled ends did not occur in that treasure or in any of the earlier representations of Asiatics. The torque did occur in later contexts, in Egypt, Nubia, Ajjul and the MB II A of Byblos and Ras Shamra. Its date should, therefore, be earlier Eighteenth Century B.C.

Other contents of the Deposits

The contents of the Deposits were dated by the three classes of objects discussed, spearheads, axes and torques to the Nineteenth and Eighteenth Centuries B.C. Though a few objects may have been older, most of the contents of these deposits are contemporary with the MB II A

¹Above, p. 601, H 96.

²Illahun town was dated to Senwosret II and later; the Buhen burial resembled burials at that site that contained late Middle Kingdom water jars.

³Below, pp. 881 and 1040.

⁴Morgan, Fouilles a Dahshur Mars-Juin 1894, plate XXI.

1 and 2; the jars themselves belong to the end of the MB II A 2. Included below is a Table (30) of these deposits; all of the objects are not considered in this table. Toggle pins, tools and some oddities were left out. The main purpose of this table is to show that the contents of the Deposits interlock. Though some objects as stopped and button-tang spears were clearly early and others such as duck-bill axes were clearly late, there is no evidence for development in the Deposits themselves. Though some Deposits might contain more early materials than others these might also contain some objects of the latest date as well.

The most important objects which we did not discuss from the Deposits above were blades and figurines. Of the dagger blades, the group with bulges and/or ribs is of greatest interest. There are two classes of these, one with a single bulge, often with ribbing on it, down the center of the blade. This type of blade occurred in the Kom el Hisn cemetery in Egypt in the company of the fenestrated axe.¹ The second type of ribbed dagger has two bulges or ridges on either side of a central groove. The famous gold dagger from Deposit 14433 was of this type.

As many or more different types of metal figurines (mostly copper) were found as there were types of blades. These are divided into two general classes, those cut from sheets of metal and those that were cast in molds. Two general subtypes of those figures cast in molds can be distinguished, the more naturalistic figurines and the very schematic representations. The vast majority of all of the figurines were male. Women, where they occurred, were almost always nude; there may have been a single clothed example in the cut-out class. The males

¹Above, p. 49.

were shown standing with their feet together or striding, often with weapons added. The male with upraised arm (Baal type) was rare. Most of the male figurines of the cast type were nude, wearing a conical hat, rarely shown with vertical striations. The males were often shown kilted; where detail was shown, this kilt had a diagonal flap across the front. Weapons shown included staves and fenestrated axes. In making some of the statuettes, there was an attempt at creating facial and body features. These higher quality naturalistic figurines retained the tall slender proportions of the cruder figurines. They were sometimes executed with elegance; the best example was from 14433. Egyptian craftsmanship was rarely imitated; two examples of this came from 14433, a sphinx and a statuette. Otherwise these statuettes were a continuation of the tradition seen in the Amuq G figurines with caps.¹

The most important example of Egyptian influence in the Deposits was the great collection of faïences in deposit 15121, from the Procella of the Obelisk Temple. Dozens of figurines were found, including hippopotami, standing, at bay, and recumbent, hedgehogs, sheep, dogs and Taueris figurines. There were nude female figurines and grotesque humans, often dwarves, apparently in pain. Vessels were also found in the characteristically Egyptian "salad mixer" shape as well as local vessels which included the sinuous-sided chalice and shoulder handle jar shapes.²

The gold fenestrated axes were undoubtedly the most striking objects from those deposits. These sometimes had animals molded on the

¹Braidwood and Braidwood, Excavations in the Plains of Antioch I, plates 57-64.

²Above, pp. 851-52.

blade in local style. More often, the blade was undecorated, but there were gold haft covers in the eyes. These haft covers were decorated with granulation in gold and sometimes encrusted with gems. In deposit 16694 there was a set of haft covers from the eyes and the lower shaft of an axe with Mesopotamian motifs. These included opposed mixed beings with standards and a Larsa style presentation scene.¹ Some of the golden axes were rather elongated, indicating a date for some of these close to that of the duck-bill axe, toward the end of the Eighteenth Century.

The objects from the Deposits are thus largely native types, often superbly executed in precious materials. Just as often, the statuettes are crudely made. Egyptian influence is confined to the deposit with the faiences, a few statuettes and the scarabs (and figures) from the Montet Jar. Mesopotamian influence is even more slight, consisting of a few cylinder seals from the Montet Jar and the haft covers cited above. Egyptian influence is more deeply felt in the use of hieroglyphic writing in the Royal Tombs and the Obelisk Temple inscription. In addition, the inscription of Yantin accompanied a normal example of Egyptian relief art.

History and the Archaeology of Byblos in Eighteenth Century

We are uniquely fortunate in that we have a large body of materials from Byblos that can be correlated with a known Dynasty of local princes. It remains for us to coordinate the date of settlement with the historical evidence to obtain some sort of historical information on the MB II A.

¹Dunand, Fouilles de Byblos, Tome II, plate LXXXII, 16700-2.

The historically fixed princes and tombs of Byblos are as follows:¹

TABLE 28

THE RULERS OF BYBLOS IN THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH DYNASTIES

Prince	Tomb	Other	Phase MB	Pharoah
Abishemu I	I	Possibly Obelisk Inscription	II A 1	Amenemhat III
Yapi-shemu-abi	II		II A 1	Amenemhat IV
Yakin-ilu (or Yakin, father of Yantin)				Sehetepibre ^c II or III (XIII-5 or 9)
Yantin (or Yantin-Hammu)	IV	mention tempus Zimri-Lim (1714-1696)	II A 2 and/or B	Neferhotep I (XIII-22, ca. 1740-30)
Hasrurum son of Rum (prince of the land of Byblos)				Sihathor (XIII-23 ca. 1730)

There were some rulers and persons associated with Royal Tombs who were not dated by reigns of kings of Egypt. There were some with no tombs assigned as in Table 29.

A number of combinations would acceptably accomodate all of these rulers. Any combination should, however be consistent with the

¹K. A. Kitchen, "Byblos, Egypt and Mari in the Early Second Millennium B.C.", *Orientalia*, 36 (1967), pp. 39-54; Albright, "The Eighteenth Century Princes of Byblos"; Albright, "Further Light on the History of Middle-Bronze Byblos", *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 179 (1965), pp. 38-43 contains Albright's views on the Dynasty: Albright, "Remarks on the Chronology of Early Bronze IV-Middle Bronze IIA in Phoenicia and Syria-Palestine", *BASOR*, 184 (1966), pp. 26-35 contained some further remarks, but little on the Giblite Dynasty.

TABLE 29

UNDATED RULERS OF BYBLOS

Prince	Tomb	Other	Phase	Date
Ilima-yapi (perhaps not a prince of Byblos)	IV			Between Yapi-shemu-abi and Yakin?
(Group II) Abishemu II	IX	Possibly obelisk inscription above, vase fragments tomb IX	(II B 1?)	17th Century (?)
Yapashemu-abi (son of Abishemu)				17th Century (?)
'Egel (son of Abishemu)				17th Century (?)
'Egeliya (son of 'Egel)				17th Century (?)
Rynty			(III A)	17th Century (?)

following archaeological evidence. Tombs I-II belonged together as an archaeological group in the MB II A 1. Tomb IV, with the name of Yantin contained painted decoration on a caliciform cup and a carinated cup. The Deposits were made toward the end of the MB II A 2 and were later than the obelisk inscription of an Abishemu and contained faiences dated to the late Eighteenth Century.

Kitchen pointed out that both the middle and low Babylonian chronologies are feasible within the limits of the Neferhotep-Yantin-

Yantin-Hammu-Zimri-Lim synchronisms.¹ If Neferhotep reigned 1741-30 and Zimri-Lim from 1778-60 as in the middle chronology, Yantin must have ruled at least twenty years, from 1760-41. By the low chronology, Zimri-Lim ruled from 1714-1696; Yantin must have ruled at least 15 years, 1730-14. If the middle chronology is used, there is little room for Ilima-yapi,² who was probably a prince and very little if the princes Yapa-shemu-abi and 'Egel were sons of the first Abishemu, unlikely in any case. With the low chronology, there is room for them all in the period between Yapa-shemu-abi and Yakin.

In balance, Kitchen's order of kings is probably the best, except that Ilima-yapi may have preceded Yakin (-ilu). The dates are extremely problematic. Consistent with the low chronology, which we have adopted for other reasons, the first group is of MB II A date, the second is of MB II C or III A date.

The last person in the first group, Hasrurum son of Rum, was not a Prince of Byblos, but a Prince of the Land of Byblos. There is thus no problem in considering him a contemporary of Yantin. It was during the reign of Yantin that the transition from MB II A to II B most likely took place.³ In any case, it is clear that the MB II A 1 was associated

¹Kitchen, "Byblos, Egypt and Mari in the Second Millennium B.C.", p. 49.

²Albright, "The Eighteenth Century Princes of Byblos", pp. 40-41. Kitchen and Albright consider Ilima-yapi possibly a son of Yantin; if Tomb IV is Yantin's, then Ilima-yapi should be earlier. If he succeeded Yantin, Tomb IV would be his. Kitchen offers hypothetical figures for the Dynasty on p. 53.

³If the low chronology is used, Yantin ruled from at least 1730 to 1714; since the deposits are to be dated in the late Eighteenth Century (Above pp. 850-51), it probably took place in this reign. The figures given are only minimum figures.

TABLE 30 Continued.

With Kilt and Hat "Baal"	Nude	Nude with Hat	Hands at Sides	Molded Male Figurines, Naturalistic:	With Kilt Poss. Hat	Nude, Often with Hat	Hands at Sides	Female Figurines, nude: Schematic	Naturalistic	Animal Figurines: Schematic	Naturalistic	Jewelry:	Torques	Bar Bracelets	Roundels	Granulated Decoration	Bronze Vessels	Pottery Container
																		Painted Ovoid Jar with Rope Decoration
X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	Painted Convex Tubular Jar and Lid
X	X	X	X		X	X												Undecorated Ovoid Jar with Everted Rim
													X	X			X	Painted Amphora with Flat Base
																X		
	X	X	X							X	X							Painted Convex Cylinder Jar
			X														X	Convex Cylinder Jar with Painted Everted Rim
																		Amphora with Flat Base
X			X		X	X				X								Painted Convex Cylinder Jar
	X					X	X			X	X							Large Painted Dipper
			X		X				X								X	Flat-Based Amphora
				X	X			X		X								Painted Cylinder Jar and Lid
																		Convex Cylinder Jar Cylinder Jar and Lid
	X	X	X															
	X	X			X	X				X								Amphora with Flat Base
																	X	Painted Cylinder Jar and Lid
	X									X								Convex Cylinder Jar and Lid
	X	X	X		X	X					X							Painted Convex Cylinder Jar

TABLE 30 Continued.

With Kilt and Hat "Baal"	Nude	Nude with Hat	Hands at Sides	Molded Male Figurines, Naturalistic: With Kilt Poss. Hat	Nude, Often with Hat	Hands at Sides	Female Figurines, Nude: Schematic	Naturalistic	Animal Figurines: Schematic	Naturalistic	Jewelry:	Torques	Bar Bracelets	Roundels	Granulated Decoration	Bronze Vessels	Pottery Container
X			X											X			
X	X		X														Painted Convex Cylinder Jar
																	Two Convex Cylinder Jars
	X											X					Amphora with Flat Base
																	Slightly Convex Cylinder Jar and Lid
X			X		X	X											Short Cyl. Jar with Everted Rim and Lid
			X														Convex Cylinder Jar with Lid
	X	X	X		X	X						X		X	X		Convex Cylinder Jar with Rope Decoration
	X	X	X		X											X	Amphora with Flat Base
															X		Convex Cylinder Jar with Lid
		X	X				X		X								
X	X	X	X		X	X			X								Small Amphora with Flat Base and Cup
			X														Small Convex Cyl. Jar w. Hemispherical Cup
X	X	X	X			X			X		X					X	Painted Convex Cylinder Jar with Lid
X	X	X	X			X										X	Painted Convex Cylinder Jar with Lid
													X	X	X		Small Amphora with Flat Base
X																	Amphora with Flat Base
											X	X	X		X		Amphora with Flat Base
											X	X					Plump Dipper

TABLE 30 Continued.

-
-
- ¹Many tools.
 - ²Deposit of jewelry and scarabs.
 - ³Deposit of jewelry and scarabs with tubular amulet of late Middle Kingdom type.
 - ⁴Clay statuettes as well.
 - ⁵Clay animal figurines.
 - ⁶Clay ploughing scene.
 - ⁷Man on bull; fenestrated axe is miniature carried by figurine.
 - ⁸Jar with few objects, no complete figures or weapons.
 - ⁹Decorated bull.
 - ¹⁰Figurine in a metal boat.
 - ¹¹Bronze situla decorated as a bull's head. Molded statuettes are described rather than depicted: they would thus all be schematic, probably of all types except feminine.
 - ¹²Consisted only of a single tool, an axe, with a marked on it, with only possibly some ore objects including the blades.
 - ¹³MB II A dipper 10715 found in jar, bronze support and heavy toggle pins.
 - ¹⁴Non-distinctive pottery; 53 very poor figurines.
 - ¹⁵"Depot d'offrandes de l'angle N.-O. de la cour" contained golden axes, some with molded, others with granulated decoration, two excellent statuettes, a sphinx and the Ryblos dagger.
 - ¹⁶Few objects--one unrepresented figurine difficult to classify.
 - ¹⁷Jar only.
 - ¹⁸Some blades not represented, and metal boats.
 - ¹⁹The "Depot d'offrandes de la pro-cella du temple aux obelisques" contained faiences. It also contained pottery 15473--MB II A2, and less distinctive 154368, 15476, 15474, tapered cup 15473.

TABLE 30 Continued.

20 Small deposit with zoomorphic vessel shaped like a bull.

21 "Depot d'offrandes: A de l'avant court" contained golden axes, with granulated decoration and molded decoration, vulture pendant, scarab, haft coverings with Mesopotamian motifs and a gold vessel shaped like a feminine torso.

22 Small deposit.

23 Three tapered cup with painted decoration and two bulged cup with painted decoration and side handle.

with the first two rulers of this group. The date when it gave way to the MB II A 2 is unclear during the period. The date of the end of the MB II A 2 is clearly set by the occurrences of the faïences in the deposit in the late Eighteenth Century; the obelisk inscription is less important for this date, though it showed that the MB II A 1 preceded the Deposit phase, MB II A 2.

Other Sites of MB II A Occurrence

Masses of material of MB II A date have been found only at Byblos. It occurred at Ajjul, in the Courtyard Cemetery group 1. There it consisted of a few burials with MB II A 1 pottery and a torque.¹ This was the only clear case where the MB II A occurred in Palestine. Other occurrences included that of two biconical jugs with bar handles in a tomb at Ain Shems.² The occurrence is made doubtful by the simplicity of the shapes. Late Bronze Age pottery often had similar simple shapes.³ We have mentioned axes of MB II A date in Palestine, the fenestrated axe from Temple 4040 at Megiddo, the axe from the amphoriskos at Jericho and another from Ma abaroth. These occurrences of the fenestrated axe were probably imports, since local bronzes of EB IV date are so simple. Tomb 84 C at Megiddo, however, contained a fenestrated axe without pottery.

This occurrence at Megiddo parallels the occurrence of the fenestrated axe at Ras Shamra. There it appeared in the company of toggle pins and torques, also without pottery in tombs (there were duck-

¹Below, p. 1040.

²Below, p. 1076.

³Guy and Engberg, Megiddo Tombs, plates 45-48.

bill axes as well in similar graves).¹ Only one pot shows the curiously sloppy painting of the Deposit style at Ras Shamra, from the deposit below deposit 68; it was not associated with the fenestrated axes or "Porteurs des Torques" burials. Another fenestrated axe was found at Amrith immediately below materials of the MB II B, in a tomb.

The classic fenestrated axe was found farther inland in Asia, however. Occurrences included Kültepe II and Hama H in a tomb.¹ Since these are not in contexts associated with the coastal MB II A culture, the presence of fenestrated axes cannot be used as an indication that this culture was present.²

In Egypt, fenestrated axes occurred in the sand-pit burials of Kom el Hisn, with daggers of the ribbed and veined types found in the Byblos Deposits.³ There were, however, no torques.

It is far easier to say where the coastal culture of the MB II A was not found than where it was found. It clearly occurred at Byblos, and was fairly clearly represented in the Courtyard Cemetery of Ajjul. It may have been found in a tomb at Ain Shems in the same region, though the pottery may have been imported or later. It is clear, however, that the rest of Palestine contains no known occurrence of MB II A pottery; other characteristic features of MB II A, such as the fenestrated axe are present as rare imports. It should be clear that the people of the MB II A on the coast had rather little to do with the inhabitants of Palestine. Even where the occurrence of the MB II A is clear, as at

¹Above, p. 861.

²The coastal culture is so closely related to that of Syria that it would be difficult to determine where the fenestrated axe originated.

³Above, p. 865.

Ajjul, it is unimportant.

Though the fenestrated axes have been found in Syria, Anatolia, even as far away as Luristan,¹ its occurrence with other features of the MB II A such as the torque and toggle pin with heavy head may be significant. These features occurred together at both Hama H, Ras Shamra, as well as at Byblos; they may show the cultural relationship between sites that have different pottery. In the next period, other features of Syrian type were adopted by the MB II as well.²

Though the fenestrated axe was native to Syria and the Lebanon coast, it was foreign in Palestine and Egypt. In Egypt, its occurrence was with daggers of Byblos Deposit type in burials without pottery; these few burials may be of foreigners.³

We may characterize the presence of MB II A objects and pottery by three types of occurrences. The first type is that of the objects in their native area and culture. We can be sure only of Byblos and Ajjul. The second type is with the native culture, but not in the home area. Only tombs, probably of merchants or soldiers belong to this category, including the burials at Kom el Hisn and Helwan in Egypt, Tomb 84 C at Megiddo, and a tomb at Beth Shan with an axe that is almost a duck-bill (chronologically it could belong to MB II B).⁴ The third

¹Schaeffer, *Stratigraphie Comparée*, fig. 264, 12, 13.

²The linear painted style found on Deposit pots is common in North Syrian MB II; the subsequent adoption of such motifs as the cross-hatched triangles must also be due to Syrian influence. Below, pp.1169-71

³Above, p. 865, note 5. Note also the MB II A 2 pot from the dump above.

⁴Since the true duck-bill occurred in Deposit 10585 at Byblos, any more primitive form, such as the Beth Shan axehead, should be MB II A in date.

type of occurrence is that of imports. In Egypt, such imports may include the anchor axe at Abydos, the torques at Buhen and Illahun, and possibly a single MB II A pot at Illahun.¹ Imported objects to Palestine may include the pots from Ain Shems. They probably include the fenestrated axes from Ma^cabaroth and Jericho and probably include the axe from Megiddo temple 4040 as well.

Since the most common exports of the MB II A culture were bronzes of types common in Syria, it is impossible to distinguish between objects of the second and third categories there. The culture of Syria was similar to the coast, so we would expect to find similar metal objects. The same may be true of the coastal sites in the north of Byblos such as Ras Shamra. There was no pottery clearly of the MB II A type and little of MB II A 2, but the metal types closely resemble those of Byblos.

The sites where the MB II A 2 has been found include only Byblos (Sin el Fil) and Ajjul for certain, probably Amrith, possibly Ain Shems as well as Ras Shamra. The difference between the distribution of this phase, which was solely coastal, and the next, which was found all over Palestine, is the first important break in the history of the Middle Bronze Age. The date can be clearly established by the occurrence of faïences in the Pro-cella of the Obelisk Temple in the late Eighteenth Century B.C.

¹Petrie, Illahun, Kahun and Gurob, plate I, number 19.

CHAPTER XIX

THE MIDDLE BRONZE II B - III IN PHOENICIA

The change in the geographical distribution of the Coastal MB II is the most important change that occurred in the MB II B. From this time forward, the MB II - III of this type must be considered the Middle Bronze Age of the Syrian Coast and Palestine, or Syro-Palestinian MB. It will be distinguished from the Middle Bronze of Inland Syria or the similar Amuq-Alalakh MB.

Byblos

The private tombs at Byblos contained materials of MB I through III dates. The materials of the MB II B can be clearly distinguished in tomb III which may be unmixed (Figs. 283, 284).

Private Tombs

Private tomb III

This tomb contained materials only of the MB II period, probably only the MB II B. The most important change in the materials, the introduction of painting in red and black bichrome, was found here. A rather globular jug has a bilobate lip, eye and multiple-strand handle. A pattern of black linear decoration is on the neck, with three groups of narrow horizontal black lines on the body. Between the first and second of these groups is a pattern of concentric circles or a spiral

in black with shading in red.¹ We shall see this type of jug again in the Sidon cemeteries. A tankard of wide early type (See Fig. 250 for a series of biconical tankards with side-handles) has rim-shoulder handle, bent-out rim and combed surface. There was a platter with lug handle and red slip. A pitcher is shaped like an oversized dipper; it has irregularly-spaced narrow black bands on a polished red surface. Fourteen plump dippers, have a more elongated shape than those of the MB II A,² and five large amphorae have pointed bases. The pottery from this tomb is thus more developed than that of the MB II A at Byblos. The jug with bilobate lip, and bichrome decoration, the advanced dippers and the tankard are especially significant as links to the Sidonian cemeteries of the same date.

Weapons from private tomb III include a spearhead with short socket, four dagger blades, three with rivets, and two simple duck-bill axes. These duck-bill axes also parallel those found at Sidon in Lebea tomb 1 a (Fig. 285). Together these tombs give a clear context for the duck-bill axe.³

¹Unpublished, in the Beirut Museum; a photo has been published, but it does not show the decoration (see number 929 below); Pierre Montet, Byblos et l'Égypte; Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, vol. 11 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1928), pp. 246-48. Objects from tomb III include: 929, a bilobate-lip jug, plate CXLV; 930-5, amphorae; 931, a large dipper with narrow black bands painted on it; 932, 14 dippers with flat bases and pinched lips; these are taller than those of the Royal Tombs, plate CXLVII; 933, a very round tankard with the handle at the rim, plate XLVI; 934, biconical cup with double side handle, plate CXLVI; 935, cup with flared rim and side handle, plate CLI; 936, see 937; 937, round bowl with side handle and lug, plate CXLVII; 938, spout with white spots and an animal on the top (see earlier deposit); 939, "alabaster"; 940 and 941, two simple duck-bill axes; 942, short-socket spearhead; 943, plain dagger, plate CXLIX; 944, same; 945, dagger with no rivets but a rib, plate CXLIX.

²Ibid., plate CXLVII (compare this with fig. 2 c-i).

³Below, p. 903-904, Amrith.

Private tomb I-II

These two tombs are two chambers which have been joined. There was no clear reason to separate the material by chamber; it was not found in a formal excavation. It was discovered during the off-season and the materials recovered by Montet upon his return to the site.

The material from this pair of chambers extends in date from the MB I to the MB III. We may distinguish the various periods typologically. A four spout-lamp indicated the presence of MB I.¹

The second period of use was in the MB II, probably the MB II B. Pottery assigned to this period of use includes three cups with side handles and everted rims, a convex cup, a very wide tankard, and a bowl with double handle. The tankard and side-handle cups can be compared with those of tomb III.²

Tombs I and II were re-used in the MB III A, perhaps almost at the end of that phase. Assigned to this phase were a fish-shaped jug, probably the ancestor of the Yehudiyya type, a bowl with bulls' heads and some Yehudiyya juglets. These include an example with incised and punctate decoration in standing and pendant triangles, one with a ridged rim but incised and punctate decoration in vertical zones (MB III B), and a representational Yehudiyya ware juglet with incised lotus

¹Montet, *Byblos et l'Egypte* pp. 245-46, number 913, plate CXLVI is the only object clearly of this phase of the tomb.

²*Ibid.*, pp. 245-46. Pottery from this phase of the tomb included the following: 922-24, three sided-handled cups with flared rims; 925, side handle convex cup, fig. 109; 926, very wide tankard, fig. 109; 927, bowl with double handle, fig. 109. Some pottery may belong to this phase: 920, juglet fragments with black lines painted on a red polished surface; 921, cup.

decoration. There was one red-burnished juglet.¹

The juglets with incised and punctate triangles and lotus clearly belong to the MB III A at Tell ed-Dab^ca; the juglet with the vertical zones may be dated to the early MB III B.²

Pottery from the Town

Compared to the masses of material from the MB II A, we have comparatively little of MB II B-III date from the town (Fig. 259).

The presence of materials of MB II B-C date was indicated by two dippers. One of these had the combined painted broad and narrow bands of MB II B³ (Fig. 259a). A second had a flat base of MB II B-C type.⁴ One jug with shoulder handle (Fig. 22 b) could be dated to the later MB II or MB III A.

There were a number of Yehudiyya juglets that could be dated to the MB II C or MB III A. These included three with metopes, one with standing triangles (Fig. 259, c, d, f). One representational Yehudiyya ware juglet had vertical rows of diamonds with lotus flowers between them. The background was covered with the punctate dots while the design was free of them (Fig. 259 e).

¹Ibid.. Pottery from this phase of the tomb included the following: 910, fish-shaped juglet; 911, bowl with bulls' heads; 914, Yehudiyya juglet with vertical zones, plate CXLVI; 915, Early Yehudiyya juglet with standing triangles and metopes, plate CXLVIII; 916, Early Yehudiyya juglet with standing and pendant triangles, plate CXLVIII; 917, Early Yehudiyya juglet with standing and pendant triangles of yellow ware, plate CXLVIII; 918, Early Yehudiyya juglet with lotus decoration (black), plate CXLVIII; 919, juglet with red burnished surface, plate CXLVI. There was some doubt about the placement of the following: 912, bowl with bull's horn; 928, ivory petals.

²Above, pp. 75-76.

³Below, pp. 919-921.

⁴Below, pp. 891-893 for occurrences at Sidon; for occurrence at Megiddo, see p. 921.

There were a number of carinated bowls with short necks and everted rims as well as small jars with short vertical necks (Fig. 259, g, h). These were of MB III A type.¹ There was one flared-carinated bowl; these will be seen in the MB III A 2 and later.²

Although there was clear evidence for occupation at Byblos in the period from the end of the MB II A to the end of the MB III A, there was no direct evidence to link any of the materials to the second group of rulers of Byblos recognized. These did, however reign later than the first group. Since there is no evidence of occupation at the site in the MB III B-C, they must have reigned in the Seventeenth Century.

They were: Abishemu II, Yapa-shemu-abi, Egel (Egeliya), and 'Egeliya.

Neither the pottery of the Byblos Royal Tombs (MB II A 1) nor the characteristic decorated pottery of the Deposits (MB II A 2) was found with these tombs. Further, none of the MB II B 1 pottery was found with the deposits or in the Royal Tombs, though it also was found in the town (Appendix D). It should be clear that the Royal Tombs phase (MB II A 1), the Deposit phase (MB II A 2) and the MB II B 1 (Private tomb I) are successive developments in the characteristic pottery of Byblos. Each type of pottery occurred in town debris, indicating that each type was in wide use in the town. Yet the well-defined groups, the Royal Tombs, Deposits and Private tombs each did not contain pottery of more than one of the major types. The distinction that

¹Below, pp. 929-932.

²Below, pp. 932-933.

for the differences in the three types of pottery cannot be a difference in use or social class: the three groups differ in date.

In addition, there was a scarab found with the name of a prince of Byblos Rynty. The style of the scarab is that of the "royal scarabs" of Maaibre^c and Jakb^cam.¹ Since these belong to the Hyksos Age, Martin placed the Prince Rynty at the end of the second group of Princes of Byblos.²

Tombs of the Sidon Region: Lebe^ca,
Ruweise and Madjluna

Due to the nature of the publication and the mixing of several groups, the tombs of the Sidon region are difficult to use. However, they form an all-important link between the Middle Bronze II of the Phoenician Coast and that of Northern Palestine. The tombs at Lebe^ca ranged in date from MB II B to MB III A; those of Ruweise were of the same dates, though most were from the MB III A.³ Only one of the tombs may have contained materials of MB III B date. The Madjluna tomb contained a mixed group that contained materials that ranged from MB III A to Late Bronze Age.⁴ While the number of recovered skeletons mentioned in the text varied, these were chamber tombs and the groups should all

¹Geoffrey Martin, "A Ruler of Byblos of the Second Intermediate Period", Berytus, 18 (1969), pp. 81-83.

²Ibid., p. 82.

³P. E. Guiges, "Lebe^ca, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne", Bulletin de Musée de Beyrouth, I (1937), pp. 36-42 (Lebe^ca) and 61-76 (Ruweise); Guiges, "Lebe^ca, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne (suite)", Bulletin de Musée de Beyrouth, 2 (1938), pp. 27-72.

⁴Maurice Chehab, "Tombs Phéniciennes; Madjlouna", Bulletin de Musée de Beyrouth, 4 (1940), pp. 37-53. Late Bronze remains included Base Rind I pottery.

be considered mixed unless proved otherwise. Even small groups such as Ruweise Tomb 15 could still be mixed, though there is no evidence given for it in the text.¹

The MB II B - C

Lebe^ca tomb I

The three chambered Lebe^ca Tomb I was among the earliest tombs at Sidon. It contained two jugs with multiple handles and bilobate lips. The larger of the two has a globular shape; it is decorated with dark lines around the neck and concentric circles or a spiral on the body. It has a triple handle. The second jug with bilobate lip has lines on the neck where the handle joined it. Other pots include a crude pitcher decorated in red and black and a plump dipper (Fig. 285).

Weapons from Tomb 1 include one duck-bill axe and a short-socket spearhead with convex edge and rounded point. Three dagger blades were found, one of them almost a miniature with a single ribet. The other blades have closely-set veins on either side of a broad midrib.²

Lebe^ca tomb 3

Tomb 3 contained a juglet with beveled-in rim, also decorated with the concentric circles of spiral motif. A juglet had a sloping shoulder or baggy shape (it was wider at the base than at the shoulder). It had a ridge around the neck at the place where the handle and the neck joined. There were red and black painted lines on the neck, with a collar of pendant lines at the base of the neck. The body has red

¹Guiges, "Lebe^ca, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne", pp. 68-69. The author gives only one skeleton.

²Ibid., pp. 38-39, figs. 3-4.

and black bands on it. The third vessel is a handleless jug or juglet. It resembles the handleless jugs of Ras el Ain.¹ The contents of this tomb can be dated to the MB II B, from the evidence of the decoration as well as the globular shape of the juglet.²

Ruweise Tomb 14

One tomb at Ruweise, 14, was exclusively MB II B in date, though tombs 57, 62 and 25 contained some isolated materials of that date.

A juglet has a bilobate lip, a red-burnished surface and a very angular double handle (Fig. 287). A small handleless jar has bands on the shoulder and radial slashes on the rim. These vessels are the clearest indication of the MB II B date in 14. A bowl has a sinuous profile; which it resembles examples from the Byblos Royal Tombs.³ A hemispherical cup is also similar to those of the Byblos Royal Tombs. Dippers with round mouths (b and c) tend to be a feature of the MB II as they were found at Hazor at the end of the MB II.⁴ Other pots of interest from this tomb include two jars which originally had burnished surfaces. One has a basket handle on the rim; the second has a large circular handle on the shoulder.⁵

¹Ibid., pp. 40-41, figs. 6-7, see fig. 7 b; below, p. 989 for an occurrence at Ras el Ain.

²Below, p. 920.

³Guiges, "Lebe^ca, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne", pp. 66-68, fig. 28-29; above, fig. 2 a and b.

⁴Below, p. 953.

⁵Guiges, "Lebe^ca, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne", fig. 29.

Ruweise Tomb 8

The first three tombs discussed here belong to the first phase of the MB II B (Fig. 286). Tomb 8 is the only tomb that is exclusively MB II B 2 in date. It contained handleless jars with simple bands of paint, some in bichrome. A pitcher has similar decoration. This simple decoration in broad bands of bichrome paint is characteristic of the MB II B 2.¹ A rather globular jar with shoulder handle has a band or ornament in a linear scale pattern that is unique in this period. There were juglets with sloping shoulders (baggy juglets) and a single ovoid juglet with ring base. One jar has a tripod-loop base, other pots from the tomb include a rather baggy tankard with handle at the rim, and a carinated bowl.²

Weapons include dagger blades and a deteriorated axe; they were neither well-described nor illustrated.³

Ruweise Tomb 74

This tomb is the only one whose contents dated to the MB II C, probably exclusively. The ovoid juglets have the simple rim, which, as we shall see, began in the MB II C.⁴ A well-developed juglet had the sloping shoulder or baggy profile; it closely resembled an example from Megiddo.⁵ Dippers from this tomb are much taller than those from earlier

¹Ibid., p. 63, fig. 22; below, p. 921.

²Guiges, "Lebe^ta, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne", pp. 62-64, figs. 23-24.

³Ibid., p. 63.

⁴Guiges, "Lebe^ta, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne (suite)", pp. 58-62, fig. 93; below, pp. 923-924.

⁵Guiges, "Lebe^ta, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne (suite)", fig. 89, 93 a.

tombs, but they were still not as tall and pointed as they became in the MB III. A number of rather globular jugs have shoulder handles. This type is also characteristic of the late MB II at Megiddo.¹ Taller jugs have rim-to-shoulder handles; they also resembled examples from Megiddo late MB II, as did a well-proportioned pitcher.² Less clearly-dated pottery includes a spouted bowl or jar and two amphorae.³

The most important feature of the weapons was the appearance of the rectangular battle axe with a notch in front of the socket. As we shall see at Megiddo, the type appears in the MB II B 1 and is the axe found in the tombs of the MB II, even in Egypt.⁴ One spearhead was found, with rounded point and convex edge. A dagger has badly worn edges; a single knife has a convex edge; this may be the earliest example of a type that later became very popular in Palestine.

Ruweise Tomb 57

This tomb contained mixed materials from MB II B 1 to the MB II C (Figs. 289-290). Objects that clearly belong to the MB II B include a duck-bill axe. Some pots thrown into the shaft also appear to belong to this period. This pottery includes a neck from a jar and one from a pitcher with pinched lip. The latter has several bands painted on the neck. Some of the plump dippers from the chamber may belong to the early deposit.⁵

The remainder of the group seems to belong to the MB II B 2 to C.

¹Ibid., fig. 92.

²Ibid., fig. 88.

³Ibid., fig. 86-94.

⁴Ibid., fig. 95; below, pp. 1181-1182.

⁵Guiges, "Lebe^ea, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne (suite)", pp. 30-34, fig. 48 and 49 f-i.

There is a well-shaped and polished tankard. The globular jug with shoulder handle seems to resemble those from tomb 74.¹ Other pottery from the group appears less distinct.

Weapons from the MB II B 2 - C include two rectangular notched axeheads and at least one of the four daggers; it has widely-spaced veins. The spearhead and the other three blades are less distinctive.²

The MB III A

Ruweise Tomb 25

None of the tombs at Ruweise are exclusively MB III A 1. Tombs 25 and 62 belong largely to that phase, however, though both were constructed earlier, in the MB II B 1 (Fig. 288).

The earlier elements in 25 include a cup with a handle on the side, similar to one from Ras el Ain,³ and a dipper with round mouth.

The MB III A characteristics include piriform juglets, some with the handle on the shoulder which has parallels in early Tell ed-Dab^a.⁴ Two of these have ring bases, the others have a stump or early button base. The convex bowl with inverted rim is also MB III A in date. One jar has a straight neck and everted rim. We shall see this type in the MB III A later.⁵

¹Ibid., fig. 53, 49 b and j.

²Ibid., figs. 51 and 52; note the cylinder seal, fig. 54.

³Guiges, "Lebe^ca, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne", pp. 70-75, fig. 275 m, fig. 389 c.

⁴Ibid., fig. 37, f and i.

⁵Ibid., fig. 37, l; below, pp. 931 and 1005.

Dippers and the carinated bowl from this tomb are not distinctive.¹

Ruweise Tomb 62

Earlier elements in tomb 62 include a handleless jar with a simplified or crude form of the concentric circles motif painted on the body (Fig. 291). One baggy jar or tankard with the handle at the rim has groups of narrow red bands flanked by black lines on the shoulder and belly of the pot. This is clearly MB II B 1 in date. Other pitchers with simple painted bands were present as well, probably MB II C in date, for their shape is ovoid and quite well developed.²

MB III elements in the group include a true cylindrical juglet and a jar with straight neck.³

Weapons from tomb 62 are not distinctive; they include a worn dagger and a spearhead.

Ruweise Tomb 66

This tomb belongs to the MB III A; many of the pots may be dated to the earliest MB III A 1. Fewer pots may belong to the very end of the MB III A (Figs. 292, 293 and 294).

The early materials from the tomb include a number of the dippers, which were rather plump. A small jar with vertical neck and everted rim may belong to either the MB III A 1 or 2, as could the platters with

¹Guiges, "Lebe^ca, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne", figs. 37-38. Note the weapons on fig. 35 including two knives with curved edges and a worn spearhead.

²Guiges, "Lebe^ca, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne (suite)", pp. 36-40, figs. 56-64, figs. 58 e and 59.

³Ibid., fig. 58 t and 62; note also the scarabs, fig. 65.

inverted rims and most of the piriform juglets. Most of these are red-burnished with stump or buttom, occasionally ring bases. Some of them have ridged rims or trumpet mouthpiece rims. Two bowls with the flared-carinated shape show that the time of the tomb extended into the MB III A 2. The photograph shows one on a high ring base; it is nearly a pedestal.¹

One of the most interesting features of this group is the appearance of painted decoration in dark on light on juglets. Motifs include horizontal groups of narrow lines, on either side of a spiral or even impaled chevrons. One juglet has simple broad bands of paint. Another has a horizontal ladder motif around the shoulder, with a band of pendant lines at the bottom of the neck and other narrow horizontal bands on the body. A pilgrim flask has spiral decoration. A tall dipper has a light band flanked by two black bands on the polished red surface, an interesting example of the survival of bichrome painting.²

Weapons from this tomb include a broad rectangular axe with a shallow notch, a convex spearhead and a tanged dagger with only a bulge in the center. Although this tomb is not exclusively MB III A 2 in date, it contained characteristic pottery of the MB III A generally. There is no evidence of earlier or a later burial in this tomb. It is important since it contained several juglets decorated in the monochrome linear painted style before the start of MB III B, when a simplified version of this painted style became widespread.³ The dipper also demonstrates

¹Ibid., pp. 40-50, figs. 66-73; plates III-IV; see fig. 67.

²Ibid., plate IV, h.

³Ibid., plate III, fig. 69, plate IV e; an axe is on fig. 66; note also the scarabs, including one with the name of Senwosret I, fig. 72, and a cylinder seal, fig. 73.

the continuation of the bichrome tradition. The rectangular axe also shows that such weapons were still in use in the MB III, though in a modified form.

Ruweise Tomb 73

Tomb 73 was not as pure an assemblage as Tomb 66. Earlier elements include the polished tankard, carinated bowl with side handle, the globular jug with shoulder handle, and a jug with a handle from shoulder to rim. One rather globular juglet, pitcher, and a juglet with sloping shoulder are also probably MB II B 2 - C in date.¹

MB III A elements of the assemblage include most of the piriform juglets with ring or stump bases, sometimes the ridged rim and platters with inverted rims, one with tripod loop base. One jar had a straight neck and everted rim. Two flared-carinated bowls are characteristic of MB III A 2, dating the latest materials in the tomb to that age.² One dipper is decorated with the band of light paint flanked by two bands of dark on a red polished slip, as in tomb 66.

A knife with curved edge and a dagger pommel were present.

The MB III B

Ruweise Tomb 43

This tomb is the only one at Sidon that clearly was dated to the MB III B. It contained only a dipper and a flared-neck jar which dated the tomb (Fig. 295).³

¹Ibid., pp. 52-59, figs. 73-84, plate V; see fig. 77 k, b and fig. 80.

²Ibid., fig. 77 y and v; a painted dipper is on plate V d.

³Ibid., p. 28, fig. 43 and 44.

Madjluna

Materials from this tomb were utterly mixed. Pots from some of the phases can be separated typologically however.

Pottery of MB II B date includes one handleless jar with bichrome decoration in bands and concentric circles or spirals (MB II B 1). One biconical tankard has a small handle at the rim.¹ A rather globular juglet with heavy bar handle was decorated with incised concentric circles and bands of poorly executed punctate ornament; it is probably MB II B.

A number of piriform juglets were of MB III A type; at least three of these have painted decoration. In one case, the decoration consists of broad painted bands on the shoulder and a band of pendant lines around the base of the neck. This latter feature also occurs on one of the other painted juglets; both of these have horizontal groups of painted lines above and below spirals on the body of the juglet. One has a ridge rim.² One jar has a vertical neck and everted rim, a line was incised around the collar in a spiral.³ A pendant-line style jug indicating the presence of MB III A 2 (b).

Two cylindrical juglets were not well dated within the MB III.⁴

The MB III B is clearly present. One flared neck jar has the classic shape of the type, with horizontal painted bands.⁵ One piriform

¹Chehab, "Tombes Phéniciennes; Madjlouna", fig. 6 a and d.

²Ibid., fig. 3 a; Amiran, Ancient Pottery of the Holy Land, plate 36/21.

³Chehab, "Tombes Phéniciennes; Madjlouna", fig. 6 b.

⁴Ibid., fig. 2 a and g; a Cypriote pendant line style jug is on fig. 3 e.

⁵Ibid., fig. 6 f; below, p. 1158.

juglet has a carinated shoulder, a feature of MB III B farther north; it has a pinched mouth and was decorated with horizontal painted bands on the neck.¹ The Madjluna tomb was used into the Late Bronze Age.²

"Kafer edj-Djarra"

In addition to the well-described tombs, there were some remains which Contenau excavated in 1914 and some which he saw later in Sidon (1920). Nowhere were any groups described, so the materials can only be dated by comparison with other materials.

Pottery from the tombs included dippers, a tankard, shoulder-handle jug, and juglets. One of these had groups of narrow horizontal bands painted on the body and shoulder. Another had three registers of incised and punctate metopes, Early Yehudiyya ware. These materials could be dated to the MB II C - III A.³

Materials shown Contenau in the "Second Mission" included the dipper, juglets of MB II C - III A type and a handleless jar of MB II B type.⁴ One carinated goblet with pedestal would be dated to the MB III B 1 in Northern Palestine.⁵

The chief importance of these poorly documented materials from Kafer edj-Djarra was that Early Yehudiyya ware is generally associated

¹Chehab, "Tombes Phéniciennes; Madjlouna", fig. 2 j; below, pp 1107-1117.

²Ibid., fig. d-f.

³G. Contenau, "Mission Archéologique à Sidon (1914); Tombes de Kafer edj-Djarra", Syria, 1 (1920), pp. 125-33; figs. 32-33, plate XI.

⁴G. Contenau, "Deuxième Mission Archéologique à Sidon (1920); Kafer Djarra", Syria, 5 (1924), pp. 124-25, plate XXXIV a-d.

⁵Compare *ibid.*, plate XXXIV D with fig. 336 o.

with MB III A (or II C) in this region, and that MB III B materials of Northern Palestine might be found in the area near Sidon.

Qraye

A single jug of White Painted Pendant Line Style was found in a tomb with Late Bronze II materials.¹

The Tomb at Sin el Fil

This tomb group from a suburb of Beirut contained material that ranged in date from the MB II A to the MB III B.

Earliest pottery from the tomb includes a globular dipper and a caliciform pedestal goblet of Royal Tombs type,² MB II A 1.

The MB II B 1 is represented by two handleless jars with groups of narrow bands on the neck and shoulder and a globular jug, with pulled-out bar handle and bichrome bands on the shoulder and spirals on the body.³ One duck-bill axe of MB II B 1 and a veined dagger were found.⁴ Pottery that probably belongs to the MB II B includes a globular jug with shoulder handle and a juglet with rather globular shape and ridge on the neck where the handle joined. The pulled-out bar handle and forward lean of the pot are characteristic of this phase.⁵

Later juglets include three examples of the standard Early

¹P. E. Guiges, "Lebe^ea, Kafer Garra, Qraye; Nécropoles de la Région Sidonienne (Suite)", Bulletin de Musée de Beyrouth, 3 (1939), pp. 53-63, plate XII b.

²Emir Maurice Chehab, "Une Tombe Phénicienne de Sin el Fil", Mélanges Syriens offerts à René Dussaud, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, 30 (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1939), pp. 803-810, p. 804, fig. 2 a.

³Ibid., fig. 8 a, 8 c and 7 b.

⁴Ibid., fig. 10 a, c.

⁵Ibid., fig. 4 b.

Yehudiyya ware, with folded-over rims, decorated with standing and pendant triangles. One juglet has metopes in a band between bands of triangles.¹ One juglet has four bands of running spirals or s-scrolls. It belongs to the same period as the elaborate group of Yehudiyya ware, MB II C - III A.²

A flared-neck jar of MB III B type came from this tomb as well. The rather short collar may indicate that it was an early example of the type, like the jar from Ruweise tomb 43.³ In addition, one large sherd from a jar with straight neck may be the straight-neck type of MB III A.⁴

Early painted Yehudiyya ware came from this tomb. The painted juglet has groups of horizontal lines on either side of groups of short vertical lines in a band. As we shall see, this motif was characteristic of Syria earlier. This juglet has a ridge-rim; its date is probably MB III A.⁵

Amrith

Amrith is a site in the lower valley of the Marathus River on the coast of Southern Syria near Tartus. Two tombs were found there in 1954 that contained material of MB II B date.

Tombs

Tomb 4

"Tombe en silo" 4 contained three disarticulated individuals. Pottery remains are in excellent condition. The plate shows three pitchers, two with trefoil mouths (Fig. 296). There are three jugs with

¹Ibid., fig. 5. ²Ibid., fig. 6 a. ³Ibid., fig. 3 a.

⁴Ibid., fig. 3 b. ⁵Ibid., fig. 7 a; below, p. 1213.

pulled-out bar handles; two of these had bilobate lips. The largest of these has decoration in painted bands around the neck and body, with a broad band of cross-hatching on the body. The two well-preserved jugs appear to lean forward. Five of the six bowls are well-carinated, with grooved rims and a burnished surface. This is presumably red. Two small bowls with tall proportions were found in this group. The last bowl has a rounded profile.¹

Since carinated bowls do not occur in the pottery of the MB II A, their occurrence here indicates a date in the MB II B or later. The shape and decoration of the jugs is even clearer. The bilobate lips are characteristic of the juglets of MB II B 1 at Lebe^ca, Ruweise and the Byblos Private Tomb III; we shall see them again at Ras el Ain and Dhahrat el Humrayya.² The forward lean and bar handles are also characteristic of the Sidonian and Gible materials.³ Two globular juglets have bar handles and bevelled-in rims; one of these was concave. One globular juglet of similar type had a wide trumpet mouthpiece rim, the earliest known example of the type, dated to MB II B 1.

Tomb 7

Tomb 7 was rather more mixed than tomb 4. There were four levels of burials; the upper level had three individuals on their sides but in

¹M. Dunand, Vessih Saliby and Agop Khirichian, "Les Fouilles d'Amrith en 1954; Rapport Preliminaire", Annales Archeologiques de Syrie, 4 (1954), pp. 185-204. On pp. 195-196 the tombs are discussed. Plate III gives illustrations of the material. The authors label plate III-2, tomb 4, and plate III-4, tomb 7. There were, however, two duck-bill axes in the illustration for tomb 4, so it seems likely that the illustrations were transposed. The following descriptions for tomb 4 refer to plate III-4; that of tomb 7 discusses plate III-2.

²Below, pp. 988, 1065. ³Above, pp. 885-887, 891-893.

variable orientations. Two individuals were found in the second level from the top. One of these had a toggle pin and a duck-bill axe. The third level had many skeletons, four with the head east-northeast. Two duck-bill axes and three pins were found in this level as well as a dagger with tang. A fourth level had dislocated bodies. One pin and a fragment of a normal fenestrated axe were found in it.

Pottery included burnished carinated bowls, MB II B and later, and a shoulder-handled jug (Fig. 297). Trefoil-mouth pitchers were similar to those of tomb 4 and to those of Sidon. Three globular jugs and juglets have bevelled-in rims and bar handles. One of these has concentric circle decoration and bichrome bands on the shoulder. The pottery of this tomb is consistent and like that of tomb 4, it is MB II B 1 in date.¹

Summary: Amrith

Although there were three or more burials in tomb 4 and many more in tomb 7, the pottery of the two tombs is remarkably consistent. There is no evidence of MB II A pottery, though a fenestrated axe was found at the bottom of tomb 7 confirming the sequence given for this weapon above.² Further, there is no evidence of pottery later than the MB II B 1, none of the taller ovoid juglets or the globular shoulder handle jugs of later times. *These tombs confirm two points: first, the duck-bill axe is mainly associated with materials of the MB II B 1, though it appeared first at the end of the MB II A 2 in one Byblos*

¹Dunand, Saliby and Khirichian, "Les Fouilles d'Amrith 1954", Plate III-2.

²Above, pp. 864-866.

deposit; second, the pottery of MB II B 1 type is later than the Byblos deposit phase, by the stratification of the fenestrated axe below the duck-bills.